

<b>Interview Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/739,790	SUGINOSHITA ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Tony Mahmoudi	2165

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Carl I. Brundidge (Attorney of Record). (3) Tony Mahmoudi.  
 (2) Charles L. Rones. (4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 29 March 2005.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference  
 c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.  
 If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-11.

Identification of prior art discussed: None.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.

  
 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

The examiner called the attorney of record to discuss the independent claims 1-11 containing several instances of "indirect" or "passive" operation modes and recommended modifying these operation modes to "direct" or "active" modes. In one example (in claim 1, line 3), the examiner proposed changing the phrase "a replica for storing a duplicate" to --a replica that stores a duplicate--. The attorney of record accepted all changes proposed by the examiner, and authorized the entry of these changes via an Examiner's Amendment.